

REMARKS

In light of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

At paragraph 1 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has requested that the specification be checked to determine the presence of possible minor errors. Applicant has reviewed the specification and has amended the specification to cure any minor errors that have been determined.

At paragraph 2 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR §1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

The Examiner first states that the drawings do not show a connector detachably engaged to an attachment assembly per claim 2. Applicant submits that threads 445 atop a mating adapter 455 as shown in Figs. 4B and 4C comprise a connector attachably engaged to an attachment assembly, that attachment assembly further including elements 305 in Fig. 4C.

The Examiner also states that the drawings do not show a controller per claim 17. Such a controller is shown at reference number 1205 of Fig. 12 which is described at page 14 in the specification. The specification states that the “beam control switch 1205 may control the respective amounts of light from array 405 and alternative source apparatus 1210 to be switched to outputs 1225 and 1230 of beam control switch 1205.”

The Examiner further states that the energy converter per claim 19 is not shown. Applicant submits that the output from the controller switch 1205 could be applied to any of the embodiments shown in the specification, such as that shown in Figs. 20 and 21. This particular

embodiment states that the collector rays and power distribution systems shown in there may be similar to those of previously described embodiments of the present invention.

Finally, regarding the thermal photo voltaic cell for claim 22, Applicant submits that reference number 850 of Fig. 8 depicts such a thermal photo voltaic cell as described in the specification.

Applicant therefore submits that all the features described by the Examiner are in fact shown in the drawings, and that no drawing amendment is required. Applicant therefore request that the objection to the drawings under 37 CFR §1.83(a) be withdrawn.

At paragraph 4 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 21-26 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification. Applicant notes that the energy converter of claim 21 has been discussed above with respect to claim 19 and that indeed there are numerous portions of the specification in which an energy converter is provided which converts light energy to, for example, heat energy to power a steam boiler or the like. Furthermore, Applicant has noted above that the thermal photo voltaic cell per claim 22 is noted at element 850 of Fig. 8. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 21-26 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

At paragraph 5 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has objected to claims 1-61, requesting that numerals in the claims be provided in order to understand the claims properly. Applicant submits that numerals in the claims are not required under US practice, and in fact are normally discouraged. Therefore, Applicant submits that the claims are appropriately supported by the specification, and therefore declines the Examiner's offer for the addition of

these reference numerals. Applicant requests that the objection to claims 1-61 on these grounds be withdrawn.

At paragraph 6-10, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7-12 and 17-61 over various combinations of the prior art. For reasons noted below, Applicant respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

At paragraph 11 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that claims 4, 6 and 13-16 are only objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has cancelled claim 6, and has included the subject matter originally presented therein into independent claim 1. Specifically, the recitation that the lens of claim 1 is a spherical lens is now positively recited in claim 1. Because the Examiner indicated that the subject matter of claim 6, which depended directly from claim 1 was allowable, Applicant submits that claim 1 is now in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicant submits that claims 2-5 and 7-35 depend, either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and are therefore allowable for this reason alone, and additionally as presenting independently patentable combinations in and of their own right. Applicant therefore submits that claims 1-5 and 7-35 are allowable.

Furthermore, Applicant has added a similar limitation that the lens is a spherical lens to remaining independent claims 36, 41 and 58. Because of the addition of this material determined to be patentable by the Examiner to the remaining independent claims, Applicant submits that these independent claims are allowable. Furthermore, dependent claims 37-40, 42-57 and 59-61 depend, either directly or indirectly from one of these allowable independent claims, and are therefore allowable for this reason alone, and additionally as presenting

independently patentable combinations in and of their own right. Applicant therefore submits that claims 36-61 are also allowable.

At paragraph 12 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has set forth a number of reasons for allowance.

To the extent the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance states, implies or is construed to mean that the claims are allowable over the prior art of record because the Examiner believes the claims should be interpreted to include one or more features or limitations not recited therein, Applicant's attorney disagrees with such an interpretation. Moreover, it is Applicant's contention that there is no particular limitation in the allowed claims that is more critical than any other. The issuance of the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance should not be construed as a surrender by Applicant of any subject matter. It is the intent of Applicant, by his attorney, to construe the allowed claims so as to cover the invention disclosed in the instant application and all equivalents to which the claimed invention is entitled.

CONCLUSION

Statements appearing above in respect to the disclosures in the cited references represent the present opinion of Applicant's undersigned attorney and, in the event that the Examiner disagrees with any of such opinions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference providing a basis for a contrary view.

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place claims 1-5 and 7-61 in condition for allowance, and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner is unable to issue a Notice of Allowance regarding these claims, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney in order to discuss any further outstanding issues.

Early and favorable consideration are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 

Gordon M. Kessler
Reg. No. 38,511
Tel. (212) 588-0800